



---

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 53rd MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. ROCHE (Canada)

**CONTENTS**

- GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2 750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 71, 72 and 73 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AM) ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

Mr. KIBIDI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): As **this** valuable debate on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security **comes** to an end, I shall no doubt be allowed to share the views **of** my delegation, and hence **of** the African **Group**, on behalf of which my country has the honour to **speak** during **November**, with previous **speakers**.

**International co-operation** and security are today the two **major** political issues in international affairs. On both **sides** - that is, in both East and West - exchanges of **opinion** on them are taking place. **But** the world is not limited to the **major** Powers, the nuclear **countries**, the wealthy **country**. The world is today a **single** entity, including the **third-world countries**, with **their** concerns about **peace**, economic and **social development**, the dignity of the human person and the desire for self-determination.

A regional or sub-regional conflict **anywhere** in the world, no matter how **remote**, **concerns** the United Nations, **for** such a conflict can always spread and threaten international **peace** and **security**.

**More** than 43 **years** have **passed** since the United Nations **was** created, **in** order to maintain international peace and security for future generations. The world had just **emerged** from the Second **World War**, the most deadly war mankind had ever **known**, a **war** resulting from the barbaric policies of the Axis Powers, taking the form of scorn for the fundamental principles of international law, especially the principle of respect for the sovereignty of States, the equality of **States**, political independence, the **territorial** integrity of States and respect for human

(Mr. Kibidi, Zaire)

rights and fundamental freedoms. The United Nations Charter restored those concepts, and all Member States are supposed to respect them scrupulously.

However, the evolution of the post-war world was characterized by a series of regional armed conflicts. States, particularly those that play a major role in world affairs, over-armed themselves in order better to maintain their security through nuclear deterrence. The major Powers arrogated to themselves the right to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries, whether to consolidate certain dictatorships which furthered their interests or to spread their ideological influence, thus trampling underfoot some of the principles set forth in the Charter. On the positive side, there was the decolonization of African, Asian, Pacific and Caribbean countries.

Military alliances then emerged with the purpose of defending ideological, political, strategic, economic or financial interests, with weapons placed on land, in the seas and oceans, *in the air* and even *in outer space*.

Nuclear weapons became very sophisticated and achieved terrifying levels of mass destruction. Conventional weapons were developed in an unprecedented way, to such an extent that they have become as lethal as nuclear weapons. Alongside nuclear and conventional weapons were developed chemical and biological weapons, used in cold blood to inflict terrible losses on the enemy, with no distinction between military and civilian objectives.

Here we welcome France's initiative in convening in Paris next January an international conference on chemical weapons, which should result - at least, we hope it will - in the adoption of concrete measures to ensure respect for the Geneva Protocol of 1925 on chemical weapons.

The picture is alarming, almost apocalyptic. However, there are reasons for hope; we welcome the new political climate in international relations, particularly

(Mr. Ribidi, Zaire)

between the two super-Powers. My delegation welcomes the agreement reached last year between the Soviet Union and the United States on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, which should be followed by a 50 per cent reduction in strategic weapons.

Europe, where there are considerable armed forces, has moved towards a dialogue between the two blocs into which it is divided - the communist bloc and the capitalist bloc - through the Helsinki Conference and the Stockholm Conference, which have contributed to reducing political tension in that important region of the world and to promoting confidence-building, security and disarmament measures which have contributed positively to strengthening co-operation and stability in Europe.

Also in a regional context, my delegation welcomes the efforts made by the five Presidents of Central America in the multilateral framework. The signing of the Esquipulas II agreement will obviously help to reduce tension in Central America, which should lead to an era of peace and co-operation in that region. My delegation also welcomes the resolution of certain regional conflicts, such as the Afghanistan conflict and the Iran-Iraq war, and we appreciate the efforts made in the quadripartite negotiations on Angola and the progress in implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia's independence. My delegation also hopes that the dynamic for peace will bring about great changes in other regions experiencing explosive situations, such as the Middle East and Kampuchea.

The non-aligned countries are producing many ideas for peace and progress in response to the challenges of today's world, & acting so within the framework of respect for the sovereignty of States, international co-operation and respect for the right to self-determination of peoples and human dignity. It is appropriate here to pay tribute to the memory of all the valiant sons of the third world who

(Mr. Ribidi, Zaire)

have made an immortal contribution to the history of the Non-Aligned Movement, which has evolved in a remarkable manner and which has a great influence on major international problems.

Recalling the political context in which this debate on questions of international peace and security is taking place leads me to agenda items 71, 72 and 73 at this forty-third session of the General Assembly, items specifically devoted exactly to that subject.

I wish to begin with the question of strengthening security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. My delegation endorses the conclusions reached by the Foreign Ministers of the Mediterranean members of the Non-Aligned Movement, meeting in Brioni, Yugoslavia on 3 and 4 June 1987. The Mediterranean is one of those regions where there is an excessive concentration of warships carrying nuclear weapons. It is certainly time for the non-aligned Mediterranean countries and the Powers deploying weapons there to begin a frank *ad wide*-ranging dialogue to turn the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation.

I now turn to the questions raised by draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.84 and L.85, dealing respectively with strengthening regional and international peace and security and with the need for a result-oriented political dialogue to improve the international situation.

We believe that the United Nations, by virtue of its Charter, has the fundamental responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. By the same token, we believe that in the nuclear and space age the establishment of lasting peace and security cannot result from confrontation but must be the result of a policy of dialogue and co-operation and measures to strengthen the United Nations in conformity with the Charter.

(Mr. Kibidi, Zaïre)

The question of respect for the provisions of the Charter is a fundamental one. Without the Charter and without the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who plays a political role of prime importance in the settlement of disputes under the various mandates given him by the General Assembly or the Security Council, it would be difficult to gain the acceptance by all countries of a code of conduct in international relations.

In a world in which the powerful tend to resort to the use of force and ignore the rule of law when their interests are threatened, in a world in which there is a temptation to exploit unstable situations to consolidate positions gained through trickery, corruption or resort to arms, the international community must not yield to the temptation to rewrite the Charter but, rather, agree to abide by it, for the Charter acts as an indispensable bulwark that enables the United Nations to function with harmony and balance. Of course this tool for the use of States is sometimes ridiculed, but it is still the best thing available in today's world for achieving the goals of implementing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Peace and Security.

In conclusion, my delegation, on behalf of the Group of African States, would like to reiterate its respect for the United Nations for having suspended South Africa from any participation in the work of the General Assembly and to express its hope that increased political pressure may be brought to bear by the United Nations upon the Pretoria regime with a view to eradicating apartheid, which has been declared a crime against humanity. The existence of apartheid is not compatible with the purposes of the Charter.

My delegation would also like to express its appreciation for the convening in 1987 in New York of the International Conference on the Relationship between

(Mr. Kibidi, Zaire)

Disarmament and Development, a Conferenoa that laid stress for the first time not only on the close link between those two concepts but also upon the fact that the security of States rests not on their armaments alone but upon non-military factors as well.

Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta) : Since my delegation has not had occasion to do so earlier, I should like to place on record my delegation's warm congratulations to you) Sir , on your unanimous election as Chairman of the First Committee. I also extend congratulationr to *the* other officers of the Committee. Although our congratulations are expressed when we have reached an advanced stage in our proceedings, I wish to assure you that they ue as warm and as sincere as those already conveyed to you earlier by many other delegations. Under your able guidance the Committee is carrying out its responsibilities effiofently and successfully, and I am sure that all present are encouraged by the progress achieved to date.

My statement relates to agenda item 71, and this forum grants us a unique opportunity each year to review the situation relating to security and co-operation in the Medi terranean region and to assess developments between sessions of the General Assembly. In this way we are able to exchange views on a subject of particular importance to our region and, in the light of our deliberations, we the Mediterranean countries, with ths understanding and collaboration of other countries, aim at consolidating achievements and at further enhancing peace, security and co-operation in the Medi terranean.

The Mediterranean is made up of a more varied range of peoples and historical, cultural, social, even economic and geopolitical, differences than any other comparable area. It is a region where East and West meet. As my Prima Minister

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

has rightly pointed out in a recent statement, we use *all* familiar with a phrase that has been bandied about often following its use by a famous historical figure "Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals". The popularity of that phrase has, however, somewhat blurred awareness of an equally valid description of Europe, namely: *From* the Arctic to the Mediterranean. Both the West-East dimension and the North-South dimension are relevant and important in any comprehensive assessment of the present global situation.

We in Malta continue to be concerned about the situation in our region, which, in the past, has been the arena of tension and conflicts. All the Mediterranean States are fully aware that they have a primary role to play in the development of their region. There are serious problems - like those of Cyprus, the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinian question, which is the core of that conflict - that yearn for a lasting solution and that continue to create division and tension in the Mediterranean region as a whole. There are also, however, many common factors that could unite us. It is in that context that we have seen more understanding, dialogue and better co-operation among the Mediterranean States. That trend is to be encouraged, for it will undoubtedly contribute to more stability in the Mediterranean region.

It is therefore logical that countries bordering on the same sea find it in their best interest to pursue ways of co-operation and co-ordination in strengthening their efforts towards achieving a better life for their peoples. That objective will be fully realised only when peace and security prevail in the Mediterranean. The statements made both in the General Assembly and in the First Committee clearly show that other peoples and countries in other regions have the same concerns.

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

We welcome and we feel encouraged by the positive and constructive attitudes prevailing within most of the Mediterranean countries. We note improved bilateral relations and other efforts being made by Mediterranean countries in their search for peace, security and co-operation, and those positive developments are receiving the support of other countries outside the Mediterranean region, including the big Powers, as evidenced in the report of the Secretary-General (A/43/579).

It is evident that what happens in the Mediterranean region tends to be reflected in international relations in the European region as a whole, and beyond. The concept that security in Europe is closely linked with security in the Mediterranean region as a whole is acknowledged by all.

The special geopolitical characteristics of the Mediterranean were undulined at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) by the adoption, in August 1975, of the Helsinki Final Act, in which, for the first time, relevant provisions on questions relating to security and co-operation in the Mediterranean were agreed to by the 35 participating States. The adoption of the Final Act in Helsinki is considered to be one of the historic achievements in the post-war era, affecting relations among participating States in Europe, the United States and Canada and contributing significantly to international peace and security. The process initiated at Helsinki continued to be developed at the Vienna Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, when Malta and the other eight European neutral and non-aligned States submitted a compromise document that included questions relating to security and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

Malta is proud to be a part of the agreement concluded at Helsinki, and particularly proud to have promoted for 12 years the question of the Mediterranean within the CSCE framework. Today we are witnessing increased co-operation, not

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

only among the participating States of the CSCE, but also among the European participating States and other non-European States bordering the Mediterranean Sea.

The CSCE Vienna meeting has entered its third year and its end is not yet in sight. That stark statement, however, hides a number of achievements that should be recorded.

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

The document issued on 13 May by the Foreign Ministers of the group of neutral and non-aligned countries was a significant step. Indeed, in certain areas it was a giant step forward from the Madrid concluding document. We note progress both at the normative and at the implementation levels in all parts of the document. Fundamental concepts and ideals such as freedom of thought and religion, freedom of movement, and remedies to those who claim that their human rights have been violated form a new chapter dedicated to the human dimension of the CSCE. These concepts have either been developed further from previous documents or have been introduced for the first time.

We also observe a cautious advance in the Mediterranean chapter, which so far has not only been the Cinderella but also the bone of contention at previous meetings. We sincerely hope that when the papers now before the Conference are adopted into the Vienna concluding document it will become possible for the first time to take an all-round view of this sensitive area, with specific accent on its environment, at an ad hoc meeting. In this way it will be possible for the first time for the various problems of the region, which are more often dealt with sectorally, to be aired at the same meeting, thus affording a better opportunity for their understanding. We look upon this positive development with encouragement and hope as a unique event for countries from the Mediterranean basin, particularly the non-participating States, to sit with others which are deeply involved in the destiny of the area.

Malta intends to continue to play an active role in promoting peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean. As stated on various occasions by our Prime Minister and by our Minister of Foreign Affairs, Malta's aim is to utilise its status of neutrality and its adherence to a policy of non-alignment in order to contribute actively and constructively to regional peace and security and to the economic and social welfare of the Mediterranean countries.

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

Along with other Mediterranean non-aligned States, and consistent with our commitment to co-operation and dialogue in the Mediterranean, Malta has followed actively and with interest the increasing potential that exists for the Mediterranean non-aligned countries to contribute to stability, security and peace in the region. The Brioni meeting in 1983 and the forthcoming Algeria meeting of the non-aligned Mediterranean countries next year are a manifestation of the constructive dialogue initiated by those countries and reflect a determination by all concerned to continue along this path.

The Government of Malta, for its part, is committed to a foreign policy which is clear and predictable. As my Prime Minister has said, Malta is led by conviction of principle and old cultural traditions, Malta has made it clear that in view of its European heritage and its trade relationships with the European Economic Community (EEC) it will continue to seek closer links with the Community, and its declared aim is to seek full membership in the EEC under the right conditions. Malta's European commitment does not imply turning our back on our Mediterranean loyalty. On the contrary, it means a presence which will strengthen the European memory of Europe's Mediterranean roots and connections. My Government does not accept the false dichotomy of "either Europe or the Mediterranean". For us, the two are complementary.

During the past year my Government has continued to play an active role in a number of forums in order to project its strong commitment to the peaceful resolution of conflicts in the Mediterranean, to the lessening of tension and to the expansion of co-operation in the political, economic and social spheres. Malta's Government has found it necessary on various occasions to emphasize, among other things, that Malta will strengthen its relationship with all other Mediterranean countries, especially those closest to us in southern Europe and

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

northern Africa. Those relationships are inspired not only by considerations of good-neighbourliness, but also by our shared responsibility to work for peace and co-operation in the region.

These policies should fortify the framework of relationships on the basis of which Malta emerges as a bridge between Europe and North Africa. In an area such as the Mediterranean, where tensions persist, bridging links of this kind are of crucial importance.

We note with particular interest the agreement reached by the five Maghreb countries, four of which are also Mediterranean countries, to work for Maghreb union by co-ordinating their foreign economic and financial services, harmonising education policies and guaranteeing citizens the right of free movement and residence. My Government has repeatedly stated that Malta is a door which opens upon the Arab world. It is to be remembered that Europe encompasses half of the Mediterranean.

Time and again it has been recognized that the security of the Mediterranean is closely linked with European security and with international peace and security. Various incidents have proven that events in the Mediterranean have had and continue to have a strong impact on the European region as a whole, and beyond. It is for that reason that we consistently urge that important international disarmament negotiations and agreements, such as the recent agreement on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles - the INF Treaty - should include in their scope the Mediterranean region.

It is Malta's intention to continue projecting the Mediterranean dimension in every forum and at every opportunity available, including the CSCE process, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Commonwealth, and, above all, here at the United Nations.

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

My delegation, as in previous year, has consulted with the delegations of the other Mediterranean States within the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and with other interested delegations, and on the basis of those consultations a draft resolution on peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region has been submitted for consideration and action by the First Committee under agenda item 71. The draft resolution, which has been circulated as document A/C.1/43/L.86, is sponsored by the delegations of Algeria, Cyprus, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Morocco, Romania, Tunisia and Yugoslavia.

On behalf of the sponsors, I wish to express our appreciation for the co-operation and understanding we have received from all concerned. It is the sincere hope of Malta and the other sponsors that, as in previous years, the draft resolution on this important subject will be adopted by consensus at the current session.

Mr. BENYAMINA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): In recent years the international situation has undergone a remarkable evolution marked by dialogue which over the past year has lived up to its promise.

In that connection, my delegation has already spoken of the importance and significance of this trend of negotiations which has been applied successfully in the disarmament field, for example in the conclusion of the Treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles - the INF Treaty. The same trend has also affected regional conflicts. Several of these, both because of the super-Power dialogue and autonomously, have entered into an active phase of peaceful settlement.

In these processes of settlement, the United Nations has each time been called upon to play an important role in promoting and implementing just and final solutions.

(Mr. Benyamina, Algeria)

That role may today seem natural in the light of the Organization's primary task *under* the Charter: the maintenance of international peace and security. But it should be said that while the Organisation, perhaps more than ever before, has asserted itself as an irreplaceable forum, skepticism and a lack of support remain in some quarters. It should be said too that it is still grappling with financial difficulties which can be overcome only by an active presence owing much to the dynamism of the Secretary-General. In that way the Organisation has made itself indispensable at this crucial stage for international peace and security, when we must consolidate what has been gained and make irreversible the negotiating process the United Nations encourages and promotes.

An illustration of this development from near marginalization to the inevitable return of the United Nations to authority is that a few years ago the Secretary-General expressed regret in his report on the work of the Organisation that two multinational forms had been established entirely outside the United Nations framework. We see now that those forces were a tragic failure, and that the United Nations is now seen as the irreplaceable organisation of recourse.

(Mr. Benyamina, Alger la)

While it may be somewhat surprising that some people seem suddenly to have rediscovered the inestimable services that can be rendered by the United Nations to the ideal of universal peace, we cannot refrain from recalling that the non-aligned countries for their part have never had any doubts about the vocation of the Organisation to work for peace and international security and the fact that it is perfectly competent to perform that task.

The unswerving commitment of the non-aligned countries to the Charter and to the Organisation are part of a constant commitment on their part to the universal Organisation body and the multilateralism that it represents, and for which there can be no worthwhile substitute in the form of closed military clubs or exclusive economic circles.

At the same time as the Organisation has succeeded in winning the reluctant support of its detractors, legitimate questions have arisen, and sometimes concrete initiatives, which have been taken with a view to increasing the effectiveness of the role of the United Nations and its involvement in problems common to the whole of mankind. It is remarkable that, no matter how significant the progress we are ready to acknowledge has been made in negotiation and consultation, the fact remains that it has yet to be buttressed by solving other problems that have arisen in matters of security and also in the economic, social, financial and ecological fields.

From that standpoint my delegation is ready to consider any proposal it recognises as a constructive effort. Invoking the Charter cannot serve as a pretext to avoid a debate that might have some usefulness when the Charter itself is far from being scrupulously respected.

It is true that the Charter is an instrument that retains its effectiveness and all its validity. But, need we recall that recourse to force is still a

(Mr. Benyamina, Algeria)

frequent practice and is often the rule, even when the Charter has limited it to the two exceptions constituted by legitimate self-defence and the application of Chapter VII.

What about the argument that the Charter is sufficient unto itself and there is no need to make its provisions and more explicit? Does the Charter itself not speak of codifying and progressively developing the law? Even if we were to undertake only the total application of the provisions of the Charter much would remain to be done that would require more from States which bear particular responsibility because of their permanent membership of the Security Council. Is it not simply the application of the Charter, and particularly Chapter VII, that the international community is calling for in the face of the persistence of the apartheid régime? The provisions of the Charter are not a dead letter which can be brought to life for reasons of expediency.

While remaining strictly within the framework set up by the Charter there still remains a vast amount to be done. No constructive initiative, the authors of which show themselves ready for dialogue and an exchange of ideas, should be rejected out of hand before an opportunity is offered to put to the test the possibility of stimulating a needed debate.

The United Nations and each organ within it must retake full possession of the resources offered to them by the Charter for the accomplishment of the objectives laid down in it. That is particularly true of the Security Council which today should strengthen the unanimity of its permanent members for the settlement of conflicts which sometimes date from the very foundation of the United Nations. Here again we must insist and stress the concern for exemplary conduct in conformity with the Charter which should guide the action of the permanent members of the Council with regard to their individual or collective responsibilities.

(Mr. Benyamina, Algeria)

In this context it is worrying to see that in the case of the conflict in the Middle East, which is one of those which most seriously threatens international peace and security, the appropriate efforts that should be made towards a just and lasting settlement remain singularly absent.

It is no less disturbing today to observe that because of an abuse of administrative competence there is a temptation - and this coming immediately after the courageous decisions taken by the Palestine National Council in Algiers - to prevent the Palestinian people from expressing in the general Assembly through the voice of their most qualified representative their readiness to work for the necessary just and final settlement of the Middle East conflict within the framework of an international conference to be held under the auspices of the United Nations and with the full participation of the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people, that is, the PLO.

The Middle East conflict is only one of the unfortunately numerous crises which have so seriously contributed by their persistence to the deterioration of Mediterranean security. This sea which by vocation is a sea of peace is still open to aggressive adventurism by Israel and is also the theatre of military activities by foreign forces in the region. This situation is of constant concern to the coastal non-aligned countries which are engaged in an endeavour to promote effective dialogue and extensive co-operation with the parties to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) process. If this has been pursued intensively in Vienna after the positive results for Europe that arose in Stockholm, it is still taking a long time to deal with the concerns of the non-aligned coastal countries of the Mediterranean. geographical unity and political expediency dictate, however, that the approach to the problems of security in Europe and its natural extension to the Mediterranean should properly

(Mr. Benyamina, Algeria)

take into account these concerns. Europe cannot long remain deaf to the interests of those countries and fail to give them a reply within the framework of an effective dialogue when the tensions existing in the Mediterranean threaten to affect it in the very place where it is surest of its capacity to absorb these tensions. It is an error to consider the southern shore of the Mediterranean as peripheral to its northern shore and to Europe and therefore to believe that crises can be confined to that region and overcome. It is as responsible partners that the non-aligned Mediterranean countries have organized themselves tirelessly to promote extensive dialogue with the parties to the CSCE.

At the same time they have resolutely undertaken many forms of co-operation among themselves, although that action is neither a substitute for nor a preamble to the dialogue which they hope to begin and to continue with the CSCE. After the Brioni meeting in Yugoslavia, which was so important for the action-oriented decisions taken there, the Algiers meeting provided a schedule for the year 1999 which should also make it possible to make progress in this direction.

At a time when dialogue is everywhere opening new possibilities, it is urgent to put back on the agenda the priorities an examination of which was compromised in the years of distrust and confrontation. It is absolutely vital in particular for the security of the non-aligned countries and the development of third world countries that a gradually improved international political climate should be accompanied by the neutralization of both military and non-military threats to their security. A concerted multilateral response must be given to them guaranteeing respect for the interests of all States and the exercise

(Mr. Benyamina, Alger la)

*of* their right to pursue their economic development within a structured and stimulating international environment. Only the United Nations is the right place to undertake that task successfully. It is within the United Nations that this must be organised and the process must begin here. It is our wish to see the forty-third session of the General Assembly contributing to that end.

Mr. HAGOSS (Ethiopia) : The year which is coming to an end will be remembered as a year of result-oriented dialogues and one in which the spirit of the dove pervaded international relations. This year, perhaps more than any other year in the recent past, we have witnessed the proliferation of diplomatic flurries characterized by a heightened sense of pragmatism. Many countries, powerful and weak, big and small, developed and developing, East and West, have joined hands in the pursuit of peaceful solutions to nagging problems with adverse ramifications to the maintenance of international peace and security. Persistent policies of deterrence and unilateral forms of diktat have given way to the peaceful avenues of twentieth century diplomacy. In many cases the highly revered good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and indeed the good offices of many statesmen around the world have been put to good use. Tributary efforts made in every part of the world have undoubtedly contributed to the augmentation of the mighty river of global peace. Today, even though it is difficult to assume that all global problems have been solved, it can be stated unequivocally that solid ground has been laid for the pursuit of peace and security at the regional and global levels.

To the astute observer of international relations, the lessons to be drawn from these welcome developments are quite obvious. It is apparent now, more than ever before, that the maintenance of international peace and security is not the exclusive domain of a selected military or political economic club or a well demarcated turf of some nuclear Powers. Indeed, it is apparent that peace can be attained only when all parties concerned work towards its attainment. That peace can prevail only when far-sighted statesmen demonstrate the courage and the political good will to pursue peaceful initiatives with direct bearing on the maintenance of international peace and security is not a matter of controversy.

(Mr. Hagoss, Ethiopia)

It is abundantly clear *that* the role the United Nations can play in the maintenance *of* international peace and security is irreplaceable. It is quite apparent *that* peaceful initiatives can be set in motion and bear the anticipated results only when the concerns of all interested parties are duly taken into account. It is crystal clear that peace cannot be attained at the expense of those who yearn for it. It is equally true that peace is tenable only when it is perceived to be indivisible. Similarly, it is evident that there is no global prescription for the maintenance *of regional* and well as sub-regional peace. In this respect, it is heartening to note that the major Powers can make contributions to these noble human endeavours when and if they assume their international responsibility in a manner which enhances the process of peace and when they refrain from perceiving global problems through the very often oblique prisms of East-West politics. It is enlightening to note that our global village can do without the chilly breezes *of* the cold war. But most *of* all, although peace may prevail in any region *of* the world it cannot be imposed on any part of it.

We know now, as we have known all along, that peace is indeed indivisible. We are keenly aware now, as we have been for many years, that the non-military factors of peace and security must be duly recognized *if* international peace is to prevail. The handwriting is clearly on the wall. Global problems are interrelated and their adverse consequences cannot be limited to a section of humanity. Indeed, it seems we are bound to either float together or sink together.

It is with this deep conviction that we have studied very carefully the proposal made by the socialist community of nations regarding the comprehensive

(Mr. Hagos, Ethiopia)

approach to international peace and security. When my delegation had occasion to comment on this proposal at the forty-fourth session of the general Assembly, it had indicated that with further study and elaboration, the proposal would contribute meaningfully to the advancement of international peace and security. Throughout the years the proponents of the proposal have elaborated the concept with a view to bringing it into full accord with the spirit and letter of the Charter. We are particularly pleased to note that the original notion of the world-wide system of international security has been replaced by the concept of a more schematic approach to international security. In highly commending the delegations involved for the spirit of flexibility they have demonstrated in taking due account of the concern of all delegations and, even more, in allaying some fears that the proposed system may not be in consonance with certain provisions of the Charter, we take this opportunity to assure them that we shall lend our support to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.74/Rev.1 entitled "Comprehensive approach to strengthening international peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations".

As a country which has for many centuries resisted all manifestations of aggression against its independence, territorial integrity and unity and of interference in its internal affairs, Ethiopia is keenly aware of the quintessence of peace and security. The significance of the prevalence of regional and global peace and security has been a matter to which my country has attached primordial importance. Today, as always, my country is contributing its share towards the maintenance of international peace and security. In its immediate vicinity, Ethiopia has collaborated with its neighbours with a view to finding lasting

(Mr. Hagoss, Ethiopia)

solutions to common problems with a direct bearing on regional peace and security. Together with one of its neighbours, Somalia, my country continues to undertake concrete measures towards the full realization of the spirit and letter of the Ethio-Somalia Accord concluded last April. We are aware that peace can only be realized stage by stage, and that regional stability can only be constructed realistically brick by brick. We shall *therefore* continue to pursue the same policy of good neighbourliness in our relations with our *other* immediate neighbours and, indeed, with all States which are in full accord with the guiding principles of the Charter of the United Nation.

The prevailing political climate is encouraging. Peace is a process as much as it is a product of a process of sustained human endeavour. But that same peace is vulnerable to cold breezes with detrimental effects on its sustenance. Let us therefore contribute to its sustenance by refraining from any action which might be construed as a form of interference or intervention in the internal affairs of any State. Let us together ban medieval theories associated with the negative exercise of State power, whether it be economic, political or cultural. The year that is about to end has been justifiably called "the year of dialogue" and "the year of the blue helmets". Let us commit ourselves to making the years to come the promising years of peace, justice and prosperity. Let us all sail with the winds of peace for the betterment of mankind.

Mr. SAGHAFI-AMERI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : My Ambassador is busy in another Committee right now, and therefore I will read our statement on his behalf.

In its first phase of action this year, the First Committee dealt as usual with disarmament matters, and it is now about to conclude its work on international security. Those two important issues are often discussed under one heading because of their interrelationship and influence upon one another. That, perhaps, is also why both issues are included in the agenda of the Committee. By the same token, the tenth special session of the General Assembly decided that the Secretary-General, with the co-operation of qualified        should continue to study the relationship between disarmament and international security.

The world is going through more rapid and profound changes as it approaches the threshold of the 21st century. The unprecedented progress of science and technology has brought about a dual and diverse opportunity: progress and prosperity as a result of international co-operation on the one hand, and disaster resulting from more armaments, distrust and wars on the other.

Certainly, our priority in world affairs can be nothing but international peace and security, and that calls for a new approach by all States - and especially the major Powers - vis-à-vis disarmament questions in all their aspects - nuclear, chemical or conventional armaments.

The importance of the disarmament question within the context of international security arises from the fact that the build-up of weapons has now reached such a critical stage that the very existence of humanity is imperiled to an extent unprecedented in history. The rivalry between the major Powers has led to the accumulation of the most destructive and lethal weapons developed to date. The nuclear weapons alone are sufficient to destroy the whole world several times over. Their horizontal and vertical proliferation pose a fourfold threat to

(Mr. Saqfafi -Amer i, Islamic)  
Republic of Iran)

international security. The arms race between the super-Powers has exacerbated an already dangerous situation.

In general, the lack of tangible success in the field of disarmament and arms control has lowered the level of security for all. We can deduce from that fact that genuine disarmament must take place as an effective first step towards strengthening international peace and security. In the present circumstances, where changes occur rapidly and technological developments in the military ephere take place every day, the cessation of the arms race and the prevention of a new one involving new types of weapons become more important than ever.

I referred to genuine disarmament and allow me to explain it further, since it plays a significant role in international peace and security. During the deliberations of the First Committee this year, many delegations expressed their satisfaction at the existence of understanding between the two super-Powers, taking into account the agreement reached between them on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear weapons - the INF Treaty.

Such expressions of content and satisfaction can be interpreted as no more than the reflection of an earnest hope for the immediate realization of more substantial achievements in the field of disarmament, because the INF Treaty by itself, even if fully implemented, will only eliminate a maximum of four per cent of the present nuclear arsenals. Here, I must air a concern arising from the talks on the modernization of nuclear as well as the strengthening of conventional forces.

"The entire Soviet strategic nuclear force in place in the mid-1980s will have been replaced by new or modernized systems by the mid-1990s". (A/C.1/43/PV.32)

That quotation, of course, is from a statement by Miss Solesby, the representative of the United Kingdom in the First Committee.

In that respect, one would not be surprised to see the Soviet side also pointing to a similar development taking place in the West, showing that there,

(Mr. Saghafi-Ameri, Islamic)  
Republic of Iran)

too, they are busily engaged in a qualitative arms race. As a matter of fact, it was just last week that the United States proudly introduced its "stealth bomber" as a new weapon in its "triad of nuclear-weapons systems".

With regard to that trend, it is advisable that both sides clarify their official positions, so that the INF Treaty does not serve as a vehicle for further modernization of the present weapons systems.

MY delegation believes that the qualitative aspect of the arms race needs to be addressed along with its quantitative aspect. In the field of chemical weapons, my country has been the principal victim of those horrible weapons since they were banned by the 1925 Geneva Protocol and has suffered the most from a new generation of such weapons, known as nerve gas. The technology to produce that type of chemical weapons, unlike earlier types, is very sophisticated and is in the hands of few countries, mainly the major ones. Regrettably, those weapons of mass destruction and the technology to launch them, namely ballistic missiles, were provided to the enemy during the imposed war against my country. That was done with complete disregard for the many heinous implications, including the weapons' immediate proliferation. Now, with the end of the war in sight, many countries have come to gripe with reality.

The convening of the Paris Conference to uphold the 1925 Geneva Protocol is one attempt to do that. My country has always welcomed any initiative to impose a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. As we have made clear in our statements on other occasions, the Paris Conference will only be successful if it addresses the issue at its core and with realism.

To uphold the Geneva Protocol, one must find the aspects that made it vulnerable to abuse in the past. We believe that the main task of any conference mandated to strengthen the Geneva Protocol should be as follows:

(Mr. Saghafi-Ameri, Islamic)  
Republic of Iran)

First, there should be an objective and impartial study of the effects of the use of chemical weapons in the past. Public awareness plays an important role in that respect, since world public opinion is the ultimate guarantor of any international agreement.

(Mr. Saghafi-Ameri, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Secondly, all States that are not parties to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 should be invited to adhere to it within a specific period of time. In this way, universal adherence to the Protocol should be achieved.

Thirdly, all parties to the Protocol that have made reservations on its implementation must repeal those reservations, so that the Protocol will not be interpreted as only a ban on the first-use of such weapons.

Fourthly, all States should pledge that they will not use chemical weapons in any circumstances, either in the international arena or otherwise.

Another issue which has had adverse effects on regional as well as international security is the arms trade. A substantial volume of the national revenues of countries, particularly of the third world, is pocketed by a few major States that export arms. This situation, in addition to having negative economic effects on third-world countries by draining their resources and making them more vulnerable to economic challenges, has also directly contributed to the exacerbation of regional and global tensions.

The arms-exporting countries are not often satisfied with pocketing colossal revenues; they also seek to expand their influence in the recipient nation. On the other hand, the sale of weapons involving sophisticated technology is generally coupled with the presence of military advisers of the exporting countries. It has now become a common practice that when signing an arms contract the recipient State must accept military and technical advisers and experts, which in itself creates enormous financial and social problems and difficulties. Their presence also in many cases acts as a prelude to political influence of the exporting country on the recipient State, especially if the recipient happens to be a third-world country. Unfortunately, the lack of internationally recognized and accepted rules and regulations has contributed to a continuation of this trend.

(Mr. Baghafi-Ameri, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Another important element directly linked, like disarmament, with international peace and security is the establishment of a just order in the international community. This notion calls for an administration of rule and order with equity and universality. Such justice has various dimensions at the international level. From the economic point of view, such an order prevents plundering of the natural resources of a country by others. My delegation does not wish to address itself to all aspects of this issue, since it has been taken up by other Committees of the General Assembly. However, we believe that the following measures of a political nature would be of the utmost importance in strengthening peace and international security.

The first is universalization of international rules and regulations so that no State, particularly the major Powers, would consider itself outside their jurisdiction. In other words, the big Powers should not draw up and define the rules at their own will and mercy. We see today witness to some arrogant attitudes on the part of certain Powers that behave as though nothing else exists in the international community when their interests are at stake. It is, of course, evident that no attempt to justify the implementation of those policies and recourse to force, occupation of the lands of others and resort to subversive actions in order to change legitimate Governments is acceptable to the international community. Continuation of such an attitude will only weaken the system governing international order and security.

The international judicial order should be competent and effective, so that in the early stages of international disputes their cause may be studied seriously and dealt with decisively. It is evident that in the absence or weakness of such an order there is no other choice for nations than to build up their defense

(Mr. Saghafi-Ameri, Islamic Republic of Iran)

capabilities to counter any threat to their security. It is also clear that this process in turn fans the flames of the arms race.

There should be constant monitoring of the international situation in order to diagnose and remedy problems which have the potential of threatening regional or international peace and security. Such a monitoring system would act as a preventive measure for trends that disturb the international order. In other words, in such a system the purpose is to prevent conflicts rather than to try to find solutions for them after they have taken place. As past experience in dealing with international issues has proved, international problems and tensions can be diffused and settled much more easily before they become chronic and get out of control. In the view of my delegation, the United Nations mechanisms can play a more active and efficient role in preventing crises and international conflicts than before.

It is beyond any doubt that the maintenance of international peace and security, like any other endeavour at the international level, requires the co-operation of all States. Such co-operation, in our view, can be achieved only in an atmosphere of understanding among nations, free from any sort of discrimination, with equality for all before international law, and with the strengthening of moral values in international society, based upon respect for the rights of other nations.

Mrs. OSODE (Liberia) : Under Article 1 of the Charter, among the purposes and principles of the United Nations the maintenance of international peace and security stands high in the hierarchy of aims. Participants in the Committee have often emphasized the fact that a stronger and more effective United Nations is critical to the central issue of peace and security. They have also expressed the

(Mr. Osode, Libu la)

view that our Organization is essential to successful economic and social development, and have urged the Secretary-General to use his authority to the fullest feasible extent.

It is perhaps out of interest and concern that comments have often been made that the United Nations is not progressing satisfactorily in terms of its effectiveness, the number and quality of its staff, the relationship between its minimal powers and its substantial responsibilities, the importance accorded it by its Members in general, and the major Powers in particular, and its anticipated financial paralysis.

Regrettably, as we are all aware, national interests have prevailed in international politics over considerations of global interests. This clearly suggests that the essence of the problems facing the United Nations is the attitude of States and not an inadequate legal machinery, as has been correctly reflected in many statements made here and elsewhere. Our Organization today must stand for values of permanence, rather than the expediencies and shifts of politics with its Member States.

Until rather recently we were quite concerned about our debates on many issues being immersed in rhetoric, concerned that they were conducted in an atmosphere filled with suspicion, tension, anxiety and even outright confrontation.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

We may still have a long way to go, but we can safely say that today even the most ardent critics have observed an apparent renewal of political will by Member States to utilize the United Nations system constructively and to increase its effectiveness and scope, which is all the more necessary and a particularly appropriate goal in this meaningful forty-third year of the Organisation's history.

My delegation hopes that the climate of optimism we are enjoying will become permanent. It is one that has contributed largely to the recent successes scored in the amelioration and meaningful negotiation of regional conflicts, to the recognition of the salutary services of the United Nations peace-keeping forces that were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, to the restoration of United Nations credibility and respectability and to the Treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty. The international community cannot afford to indulge in complacency. No negotiation should be allowed to falter because of political tensions, nor should it be carried out in an atmosphere of barely concealed insincerity. There must be concerted action to make further progress in those and other areas.

There is a need for greater development and encouragement of regional-security arrangements, through emphasis on trade, economic, social and cultural progress. We urge greater use of multilateral efforts and the extensive co-operation of the international community. We also encourage the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, which are now much better than in the past, to continue to improve in a healthy and steady manner.

Not many people are willing to share publicly the view that the major efforts in the improvement of international peace and security hinge on good relations

(Mr s. Osode, Liberia)

between the super-Powers, but that seem to be a harsh reality that has been accepted, albeit grudgingly. Yet we should not be swayed by power and might. The international community can change its course if it can become truly united - and especially the smaller and militarily weak nations that cannot individually influence or sway events. In any event, the historic INF Treaty, although considered marginal by some, will make further steps in negotiations between the major Powers easier, for each has now acquired a degree of confidence that their agreements must be lived up to, for the Treaty was not dictated by any outside force and their reputations are at stake.

The situation in the Middle East, which has posed a threat to international peace and security, could be peacefully resolved through negotiations, which call for understanding, a change of heart and a human touch that my delegation believes lie within the capacity of every interested and concerned party. Earlier policies that were not accommodated must give way to policies that will be advantageous to those involved. In that regard my Government will continue to support the call for the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of each and every one of the parties involved.

Needless to say, racist South Africa is another area of the world that poses a grave threat to international peace and security, because of its apartheid policies and, I venture to say, its nuclear capability. In that connection we feel that the limitation or reduction of military expenditures in the African context requires careful consideration. Specifically, with regard to the front-line States, we support the suggestion that pressure from South Africa and its threats of destabilization fully explains the military expenditures incurred by those

(Mr S. Gode, Liberia)

Statee. The reduotion of military expenditures should be considered only where the quantity of arms purchased exceeds the amount needed for security purposes, and my delegation finds it difficult to disagree with the view that there can be no ceiling on armaments against racist South Africa.

In spite of that view with regard to South Africa, my delegation believes that there should be a reversal of the arms race, both nuclear and conventional. There should be a collective or global and regional system in which security for all States would be guaranteed through the assurance of equal security for all and through effective international mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. At the same time States should consider signing, ratifying and strengthening international treaties, conventions and agreements to ensure their implementation.

The obligation of the people of Liberia, arising from their aspirations to improve their society and from the threats that increasing nuclear and conventional armaments pose for them, requires that they do all that is necessary for their immediate security. The military, long considered a source of security for most countries, will, however, continue to be a factor. Many of us have become wise enough to have a changing perception of security as political, ideological and socio-economic. No Government can escape the non-military threats to its security. In a number of African countries thousands have died and the lives of millions are threatened by famine. Droughts and deserts continue to spread. Aggravating those problems are problems of natural disasters and the debt burden that are experienced not only by the African countries but by the Latin American, Caribbean and Asian countries as well, forcing us to rely on the charity of the international community.

(Mr. S. Quode, Liberia)

Those risks are at the basis of the serious thinking being done by many developing countries, which are now paying greater attention to the many non-military threats affecting their security. We have come a long way towards recognizing that a strong and viable economy is a necessary foundation for influence, stability and security. It follows that there should be a serious reconsideration of the staggering sums spent on armaments by developing countries.

My delegation believes that no country should pretend abroad to be something other than it is at home, nor can a country pursue a foreign policy that does not have the clear support of its people. In that regard it is desirable to sensitize the public to the complementarity of its policies with that of the international community.

Indeed, my delegation strongly believes that a greater public and private awareness of the United Nations role, its present capacity and its future potential is needed in order that the major gap in public understanding that has existed for so long in so many countries can be transformed into a serious, informed appreciation of our Organization and support for its future strengthening.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

My delegation believes that the record is not deficient in terms of the work actually undertaken by the United Nations. The Charter assigned to the United Nations and its specialized agencies a variety of tasks. Rather than being frustrated at any lack of informational material, my delegation is overwhelmed by its abundance, even its waste. It would be impossible to assess accurately in a single statement all the activities of the Organization over the past 43 years. My delegation feels that to appraise the actual accomplishments of the United Nations would require careful scrutiny of the whole host of resolutions adopted by its bodies and organs, and an understanding of the extent to which Member States have taken practical steps to implement those resolutions and decisions.

Where there is no meeting of the minds in this Committee, this should not be given a negative interpretation or be construed as a lack of interest. When one does not fully grasp the significance of an issue, it will become more meaningful if one tries harder each time to gain a better understanding of it. Until that understanding is reached, my delegation finds it pointless to bind us and others to views we do not hold or policies with which we differ. This Committee should be a forum for sharing views and supporting them on their merits; this could, we would hope, be translated into consensus action.

Solutions to our problems at the United Nations and to the problems we are considering today should not be approached from the standpoint of narrow national interests or, worse still, from purely partisan considerations of domestic politics. They should, rather, be approached from a global perspective and in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN: I have received a request from the Observer of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mr. Chang Yong Chol, to make a statement. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to that request.

It was 80 decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Observer of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. CHANG (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I should like first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee and to wish you success in your responsible work.

The item "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" has been on the agenda since its inclusion at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, which proves that international security is one of the important international political issues.

Mankind has now entered in a new epoch in the process of building a peaceful and prosperous new world. A phase of detente is gradually opening in international relations, where an atmosphere of confrontation and cold war had prevailed for a long time. This enables people to have hope for a peaceful future,

However, no radical change has taken place in the process of global peace and security. The arms race - particularly the nuclear-arms race - persists; dangerous conflicts continue to take place in various parts of the world; the world economic situation, especially the economic situation of the developing countries, is deteriorating) and we are witness to unceasing threats of force and strength, interference in the internal affairs of other States, aggression against other countries, and policies violating the independence and sovereignty of States.

(Mr. Chang, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

Those realities urgently call for attention by the international community to direct attention to the global, comprehensive nature of security and to ensure both military security and security in the economic, humanitarian and other fields.

Mankind wishes to live in a peaceful world, free from aggression and war. What is important at present in terms of preventing war and ensuring international peace and security is that we turn to disarmament, nuclear disarmament in particular, the withdrawal of aggressive foreign troops from other countries, the dismantling of aggressive military bases in foreign countries, and the establishment of peaceful nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world.

My delegation welcomes the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - between the Soviet Union and the United States, and believes that the two countries should reach early agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in nuclear strategic arms. My delegation further believes that all kinds of nuclear and chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction should be completely destroyed and abolished.

My delegation takes this opportunity to reiterate its support for the constructive peace initiatives and proposals put forward by socialist countries and non-aligned nations aimed at halting the arms race, realising general disarmament, preventing the militarization of outer space and ensuring international peace and security. We express our solidarity with the peoples in their struggle to establish nuclear-free zones and zones of peace in north-east Asia, the South Pacific, the Indian Ocean, Europe, the Balkan peninsula, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, and with the Palestinian and Namibian peoples and other peoples in their just struggle for national independence and freedom, and against imperialism, colonialism and racism.

(Mr. Chang, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

Peace and security in a region and a continent are closely linked with global peace. In the Asian-Pacific region, huge nuclear forces have been deployed; nations are threatened with the use of force. This results in a complex situation in the region. The sovereignty of countries and peoples is being encroached upon, and international peace and security are being jeopardized. Improving the situation in the Asian-Pacific region is now a pressing question in terms of speeding up the process of easing international tension as a whole and ensuring lasting world peace.

Reducing tension and ensuring peace and security on the Korean peninsula constitutes a major link in the chain of the struggle to improve the situation in the Asian-Pacific region. In order to remove the threat of a nuclear war and ensure peace in Korea, foreign troops and nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from South Korea, the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula should be effected and the Korean question should be resolved in a peaceful way.

In the framework of its noble mission to shape the destiny of our nation and in the cause of world peace, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has put forward a number of reasonable initiatives and proposals to guarantee peace in Korea and to achieve the peaceful reunification of the nation, and has made every sincere effort to translate these into practice.

On 7 November the Democratic People's Republic of Korea proposed four principles for guaranteeing peace on the Korean peninsula and set forth comprehensive proposals for a phased reduction in all armed forces on the peninsula and for the relaxation of political and military confrontation.

(Mr. Chang, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

The proposals, representing a major new peace initiative, were launched at a joint meeting of the Central People's Committee, the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's Assembly and the Administration Council. The joint meeting stressed the need to ensure peace on the Korean peninsula in order to remove the constant fear of war, create conditions for peaceful reunification and contribute to the cause of peace in Asia and the rest of the world. It set forth the following four principles: Peace on the Korean peninsula must be, first, oriented towards the reunification of the country; secondly, guaranteed by the withdrawal of foreign armed forces; thirdly, guaranteed by arms reduction in the north and the south; and, fourthly, realised through dialogue among the parties responsible for the aggravation of tensions.

A comprehensive set of peace proposals was put forward to back up the four principles, detailing a timetable for the phased withdrawal of foreign troops and for north-south arms reduction, plus concrete moves to ease the present political and military confrontation. The joint meeting proposed that the nuclear weapons based in the south be withdrawn in two phases by the end of 1990. To be more precise, those deployed north of 35 degrees 30 minutes north latitude would be withdrawn in the first phase (by the end of 1989) if the proposal were adopted and those deployed south of that line in the second phase (by the end of 1990). The proposals call for the withdrawal of United States forces in three phases by the end of 1991. The Ground Forces, together with the United States Forces Command, would withdraw south of the line joining Pusan and Chinhae at 35 degrees 30 minutes north latitude in the first phase (by the end of 1989), the entire Ground Forces would pull out of south Korea in the second phase (by the end of 1990) and the Naval and Air Forces in the third phase (by the end of 1991). As to the reduction

(Mr. Chang, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

in the armed forces of the north and south of Korea, the proposal envisages a three-phase programme to the end of 1991, starting with front-line forces deployed along the Military Demarcation Line, special units and paratroopers. It recommends that armed forces in the north and south be separately cut to the level of 400,000 by the end of 1989, to 350,000 by the end of 1990 and to less than 100,000 from 1992 onwards. The joint meeting called for three-way talks between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the United States and south Korea to discuss these military issues. Democratic People's Republic of Korea/United States or north-south bilateral talks could also be held within the framework of tripartite talks. It also invited representatives of member nations of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission to the proposed three-way talks as observers. The joint meeting called for high-level political and military talks between the north and the south to relax the political and military confrontation between the north and the south. If tripartite talks among the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the United States and south Korea and north-south high-level political and military talks are held and they progress successfully, both the north and the south will hold top-level talks in a good atmosphere.

Most realistic and reasonable are these peace proposals adopted at the joint meeting, which have fully taken into consideration the will of the United States, which said that it hoped for the relaxation of the situation on the Korean peninsula, and that of the south Korean authority, who said that he would discuss military problems including disarmament.

The Premier of the Administration Council and the Minister of Foreign Affairs have addressed letters to the south Korean Prime Minister and the United States Secretary of State respectively on 16 November with a view to implementing the

(Mr. Chang, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

proposals. We believe that the United States and south Korea will make a positive response to our peace proposals in order to put them into practice as soon as possible and to ensure peace in Korea.

My delegation remains confident that peace-loving governments and peoples will continue to express their active solidarity with the Korean people in their struggle to reduce tensions, ensure peace in Korea and achieve the peaceful reunification of the nation.

The CHAIRMAN: I have also received a request from the Observer of the Republic of Korea, Mr. Nake Chun Choi, to be allowed to make a statement. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee agrees to his request.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Observer of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Nake Chun CHOI (Republic of Korea): As this is the first time *my* delegation has spoken in the Committee, allow me to extend to you, Sir, our warmest congratulations on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. We appreciate the outstanding way in which you have been conducting the work of this important Committee.

Recently, we have witnessed many positive developments in the international situation. Progress towards the peaceful settlement of certain regional conflicts and the general trend of East-West rapprochement give us a renewed sense of optimism.

Despite these positive developments, however, there still exist internationally many focal points of tension including the Korean peninsula. We must endeavour to search for common solutions to those problems in order to strengthen international peace and security.

In this regard, we share with many other delegations the view that the regional conflicts are not the result of the inadequacy of the Charter of the

(Mr. Nakr Chun Choi,  
Republic of Korea)

United Nations but arise from the behaviour of States, which do not always conform to the principles of the Charter.

We also share the view that the key to peace is mutual trust and co-operation. Indeed, we believe that building up mutual trust and co-operation through dialogue is a first step to promoting international peace.

On the basis of this perception, the Government of the Republic of Korea has sought to continue dialogue with North Korea in order to ease tension and promote peace on the Korean peninsula.

The Korean peninsula has been dominated for four decades by general mistrust between the South and the North. It is unfortunate that this confrontational situation still continues at a time when nations around the world are actively pursuing dialogue and exchanges with one another regardless of ideologies and political differences. To put an end to this confrontational situation and to restore peace on the Korean peninsula and, therefore, paramount tasks of the Republic of Korea.

In this connection, the disarmament issue is of critical importance. However, nothing is more urgent and important than taking steps to overcome mistrust and build confidence between the two parts of Korea through dialogue and contact. It is unrealistic to think one can leap from a condition of no mutual recognition and from no dialogue and contact into disarmament negotiations.

Security and disarmament are inseparable. As repeatedly emphasised by many representatives to the Committee, no arms control or disarmament measures are feasible, unless they maintain - and if possible enhance - the security of the interested States. Moreover, as weapons and armed forces are just a reflection of underlying political hostility and tension, disarmament issues should be considered within the context of the overall relations between States.

(Mr. Nak Chun Choi,  
Republic of Korea)

Given this understanding, in his statement at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, our Foreign Minister put forward a proposal which can be summed up as a three-stage approach to disarmament on the Korean peninsula.

(Mr. Nake Chun Choi,  
Republic of Korea)

He proposed: first, building up mutual trust and confidence through dialogue and expansion of contacts and co-operation between the South and the North; secondly, institutionalising an arrangement to prevent hostilities by concluding a South-North non-aggression pact; and, finally, entering into negotiation on disarmament measures.

I should like to reiterate that the Republic of Korea is willing to discuss with North Korea all matters of mutual concern, including disarmament, if they will agree to co-operate with the Republic of Korea in making the necessary arrangements for maintaining peace and security on the Korean peninsula. We are seeking to forge a relationship of partnership with North Korea.

It is most significant that President Roh Tae Woo himself made it absolutely clear in his address to the General Assembly on 18 October 1988 that even before a non-aggression declaration, which he proposed, is made with North Korea, the Republic of Korea will never use force first against the North.

As a practical step in searching for accommodations with North Korea, President Roh proposed to the North Korean leader last August that they hold direct talks. If the proposed summit meeting were to be held, all the problems raised with regard to disarmament, arms control and other military matters would be seriously discussed with a view to finding solutions.

Korea occupies a geopolitical position where the interests of the great Powers in the East and in the West intermingle with one another. In view of this important geopolitical location, an outbreak of new hostilities on the Korean peninsula might easily escalate into a global conflict.

Thus it is obvious that the search for lasting peace on the Korean peninsula cannot be considered in isolation from its relations with surrounding nations. The

(Mr. Nake Chun Choi,  
Republic of Korea)

convening of a consultative conference for peace among the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China and Japan as well as North and South Korea will certainly create an international environment more conducive to peace in Korea and reunification of the peninsula by peaceful means.

With regard to the issue of establishing regional nuclear-free zones including north-east Asia, we believe that such a proposal can be realized when there is free agreement among all the States concerned. In considering such issues, regional characteristics should also be taken fully into account.

In conclusion, I should like to assure the Committee that the Republic of Korea will continue to endeavour to ease tensions and promote peace on the Korean peninsula, thus contributing to the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. DJERMAKOYE (Niger) (interpretation from French): As this is the first time that I have spoken since the Committee began its work, I should like to address to you, Sir, and to the other officers of the Committee the warmest congratulations of my delegation on your well deserved election as Chairman of the First Committee. We are much impressed by the masterful and clear-sighted manner in which you are directing our work.

After disarmament, which we discussed at considerable length in the Committee last month, international security, is a matter of paramount concern for all nations.

It is fortunate that this item has been on the agenda of the General Assembly for the past two years and that, like disarmament, it is being considered in this Committee. There seems to be a close and indissoluble link between these two international concerns.

(Mr. Djermakoye, Niger)

In Niger, we believe, and we are in the habit of saying, that there is no development without security or stability. That is a guiding tenet, a guiding policy, one which we share with the international community as a whole and is one which we have been particularly attentive to many developments in the past few months in many areas of the world.

Arms are no longer being used between Iran and Iraq and we hope that will be true for ever. That was a particularly bloody war. Last December the United States and the Soviet Union concluded an historic Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. In Afghanistan and in Kampuchea the outlook for a peace settlement is promising. There has been an announcement about the withdrawal of foreign forces from both those countries. In southern Africa, the quadripartite talks on Namibia give rise to well-founded optimism and we hope that Namibia will soon attain its independence. As regards Western Sahara, the United Nations peace plan and the indirect talks between the parties to the conflict under the auspices of the Secretary-General suggest that there will be a positive outcome.

The atmosphere of détente and of relative calm is due to United Nations action. It is due to the provisions of the Charter and to the role being played by the Secretary-General. However, the question of international security is so complex and has so many ramifications, that it must be viewed as a well-integrated whole. The major nuclear military Powers and the small countries cannot take the same approach to security, nor can they have the same concept of security. The international community cannot share the same concerns in this area, but the final objective, security and stability, remains the same for everyone.

Negotiations between the two super-Powers and their agreements and treaties represent significant progress for mankind, but nothing can replace the system of

(Mr. Djermakoye, Niger)

security established by the United Nations Charter. All States must agree to co-operate, must agree to respect the Charter and to make it work.

We think that it would be an illusion to imagine that bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States alone, however important they may be, would be able to bring about international peace and security. International peace and security have a global, planetary dimension and transcend East-West relations.

Security should not be viewed solely in political and military terms. It must flow naturally from the process of disarmament, without which it would have no significance. It is multidimensional and its economic, social, cultural and humanitarian implications must be understood. What purpose would be served by savings derived from disarmament after the destruction of the arsenals of the major Powers if only a small amount of the money saved were used to eliminate the poverty of millions of human beings?

We must understand the dialectical link between disarmament and development and a fund for economic, humanitarian and social activities must be created as a result of savings derived from disarmament. Even if all nuclear, chemical and other weapons are destroyed the world cannot live in peace if more than half of humanity is allowed to continue to live in poverty while the other half lives in the most anachronistic form of opulence.

(Mr. Djermakoye, Niger)

Security for the developing countries means, beyond and perhaps far above its purely military definition, the establishment of a new international economic and social order that is more just and more equitable. For the small, weak countries, it also means a guarantee that they can live in complete peace and tranquillity, free from the threat of any act of aggression or use of force, in strict respect for their beliefs and freedom of choice on the basis of the principles and norms of international law.

More than 40 years ago, at the conclusion of the Second World War, the forgers of the Charter in their infinite wisdom included provisions that continue to this day to withstand the test of time and to prove themselves effective. But those provisions, no matter how relevant and sound they may be, are valid only if all Member States - great and small, rich and poor, powerful and weak - respect them, agree to uphold them and work daily to strengthen them.

The Charter's machinery, along with the Security Council which is responsible for putting the provisions of the Charter into effect and for guaranteeing international peace and security under the authority of the Secretary-General, constitute the legal and institutional framework that has been responsible for the peace we have enjoyed for the past 40 years,

All of that means that we must always strive to strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations and its system of security. We must promote the primacy of international law in relations among States.

I believe that we should welcome here and now the decision of the Nobel Committee to award the Nobel Peace Prize to the United Nations through the United Nations peace-keeping forces. That award is a credit to our Organization and, in a sense, rehabilitates and enhances its prestige. At the same time, it is evidence of the effectiveness and irreplaceable nature of our Organization. For so many

(Mr. Djermakoye, Niger)

countries, and particularly the smaller countries of the world, our Organization is the guarantor of their security and stability.

It is the strength behind those countries' defence of the spirit of the Charter and their support of the United Nations, and on which the everlasting nature of the ideals of the United Nations and the success of its actions depend.

Our country is a landlocked nation in the western part of Africa. It is located several thousand kilometers from the sea and shares the long borders it inherited from colonialism with seven neighbouring countries. It is in a geopolitically sensitive area that requires unceasing vigilance. Niger, therefore, has a keen awareness of the value of peace and security. We have often seen security threatened and disrupted in various parts of the continent, even along our own borders, but we have always worked for conciliation whenever our security has been jeopardised. We have encouraged fraternal countries to show wisdom and give primacy to the virtue of dialogue in an effort to find just settlements to their disputes.

In a spirit of fraternity and with a sense of responsibility, we conducted negotiations with Algeria which led in 1982 to the delimitation and making of our common border, and we are prepared today to carry out similar negotiations with our other neighbour, Nigeria and Burkina Faso.

That most certainly is the kind of example that other countries should follow when they are faced with delicate border problems inherited from colonialism and which, sadly, have all too often been the cause of essentially futile fratricidal clashes.

International peace and security are such precious assets that it would be no exaggeration to consider, even if we do not declare them the "common heritage of mankind". In that respect, today's generations have a heavy responsibility and an

(Mr. Djermakoye, Niger)

overriding duty to **preserve them** for future generations. For those **reasons**, we believe that the **question of security should appear** as a perennial item on the agenda of **subsequent sessions** of the General **Assembly** .

The CHAIRMAN: That **concludes** the debate on the agenda items we have been **considering**. **Tomorrow** morning we will proceed **to take action on** the draft **resolutions** under agenda **items** 71, 72 and 73 related to international **security** . Those draft resolutions are **contained** in documents **A/C.1/43/L.74/Rev.1**, **A/C.1/43/L.84/Rev.2**, **A/C.1/43/L.85/Rev.1** , **A/C.1/43/L.86**, **A/C.1/43/L.87** and **A/C.1/43/L.88** .

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) : I **should** like to inform **members of** the Committee that the **following** countries have become **co-sponsors** of the following draft **resolutions**:

**A/C.1/43/L.74/Rev.1** - Lao **People's** Democratic Republic and **Viet** Nam.

**A/C.1/43/L.88** - Sri Lanka.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.